

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner objected to claims 1-3, 14, 22-26, 34, 44, and 45 for informalities, rejected claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite, and rejected claims 1-3, 7-14, 17-28, 30, 31, 34-36, 42-46 under 35 U.S.C. 103 for being obvious. Claims 1-3, 7-14, 17-28, 30, 31, 34-36, and 42-46, remain in the application.

The claims objected to by the Examiner have been amended to overcome the rejection.

The rejection for indefiniteness of claim 36 has been addressed by amending the claim.

The rejection for obviousness was based on the same arguments as previously in the rejection of April 29, 2005, and further pointing out that for the most part that the claims did not make it clear that the implant was before the gate. The independent claims have been amended to make it clear that the gate is present at the time of the implant by stating the gate or gate stack is used as a mask during the implant. Accordingly, applicants believe that it is clear that the applicants' invention is claimed in such a way that the claims are not obvious in light of the cited art.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.


Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully solicited. Please contact the below-signed if there are any issues regarding this communication or otherwise concerning the current application.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By: 
James L. Clingan, Jr.
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 30,163
Telephone: (512) 996-6839
Fax No.: (512) 996-6854